



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,716	01/31/2002	Hideyuki Kinoshita	K-2029	8222

7590 09/08/2003
Kanesaka & Takeuchi
1423 Powhatan street Suite 2
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

EVANISKO, LESLIE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/030,716	KINOSHITA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leslie J. Evanisko	2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 6-11 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in-reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figure 21 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See page 3, line 9 and page 13, line 13 of the specification, as well as MPEP § 608.02(g).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: It appears that reference numeral **83a** in line 27 of page 32 should be --**84a**-- to use consistent numbering since reference numeral **83a** is not illustrated and **84a** is later used on page 33 to describe the one end portion.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objecti ns

4. Claims 1-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: With respect to claim 1, it is suggested that the term "a printing drum" in line 2 be deleted and replaced with --at least one-- since claim 5 recites a plurality of printing drums. Note a similar problem occurs in claim 6.

With respect to claim 3, it is suggested that the term "the other pulley" in line 11 be deleted and replaced with --another pulley-- or similar language since the term "the other pulley" has no proper antecedent basis since the other pulley was not previously recited. Similarly, it is suggested that the term "other" (second occurrence) in line 11 be deleted and replaced with --another--. Again, note a similar problem occurs in the language of claim 6.

With respect to claim 6, note the term --the-- or --an-- should be inserted before "outside" in line 7 to provide the appropriate article before the noun. Additionally, it is suggested that the term "overlapped" in line 45 be deleted and replaced with --overlapping-- to use less awkward language.

Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 8-192565 in view of JP 60-148866. JP '565 teach a stencil printing machine comprising a printing drum **1**, a squeegee roller **6**, a press roller **9**, and an exfoliation suction means **22** as recited, with the possible exception of the particular detailed structure of the exfoliation suction means set forth. See Figures 1 and 8 in particular. Although JP '565 is silent with respect to the particular details of the exfoliation suction means, note that JP '866 teaches an exfoliation suction means used in a stencil printing device including a case **11** having a guide plate **12** at an upper face thereof and an exfoliation suction port **22** at one end portion thereof, the exfoliation suction port being arranged to be proximate to the press roller **3** on a lower side of a reference line as recited, and a suction force generating portion **23** provided at the case for generating the

Art Unit: 2854

suction force. See Figures 1 and 3 in particular. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the exfoliation suction means as taught by JP '866 in the stencil printing device of JP '565 as it would simply require the obvious substitution of one known suction transport mechanism for another, to provide for better conveying of the sheet through the printer.

With respect to claim 2, note the suction force generating portion **23** of JP '866 can broadly be considered to be located "proximate" to a side of the exfoliation suction port **22**, as shown in Figure 1 in particular.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 8-192565 in view of JP 60-148866 as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of JP 11-151852. JP '565 in view of JP '866 teach a stencil printing machine as recited with the possible exception of providing a plurality of printing drums via the exfoliation suction means. JP '852 teaches the use of an exfoliation suction means between two printing drums is well known in the art, as exemplified in Figure 1 in particular. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a plurality of printing drums via the exfoliation suction means as taught by JP '852 in the device of JP '565 as modified by JP '866 as it would simply require the obvious substitution of one known printing arrangement for another to allow for multicolor printing of the sheet.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 3-4 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. Claims 6-11 are objected to for the reasons set forth above, but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections to the satisfaction of the Examiner.
11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claim 3 in particular, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a stencil printing machine comprising all of the structure recited, in combination with and particularly including, the exfoliation suction means including a transfer section with the pulleys supported by the guide plate and the shaft arranged relative to the exfoliation suction port and other structure as recited.

With respect to claim 4 in particular, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a stencil printing machine comprising all of the structure recited, in combination with and particularly including, the exfoliation suction means including a guide rib for supporting the print sheet exfoliated from the

Art Unit: 2854

side of the printing drum at the exfoliation suction port without bending the print sheet.

With respect to claims 6-11 in particular, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest a stencil printing machine comprising all of the structure recited, in combination with and particularly including, the guide plate has both an exfoliation suction port and a transfer suction port as recited, and the endless shaped transfer belt having a vent hole formed therein, wherein the transfer suction port on the guide plate overlaps the vent hole on the transfer belt to provide a suction force to the exfoliated sheet.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ohinata et al. (US 5,673,619), Ono et al. (US 5,967,510), and Kasai (JP 57-184054) each teach a suction paper conveying mechanism having obvious similarities to the claimed subject matter.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Leslie J. Evanisko** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-0786**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619.

Art Unit: 2854

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Leslie Evanisko
Leslie J. Evanisko
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854

lje
August 20, 2003